Applicant: David H. Levy Attorney's Docket No.: 13159-002001

Applicant | David H. Levy Serial No. | 09/862,948 Piled | May 22, 2001 Page | 17 of 19

REMARKS

Applicant has added claims 95-110 and canceled claims 21-29, 69-70, 80-84, and 93-94. Claim 55 has been amended. Claims 56-70, 72-74, 76-79, and 91-92 are previously presented. Claims 34-39 are original. Claims 1-15. 16-18, 19-20, 30-33, 40-43, 44-54 and 85 are withdrawn. Claims 34-39, 55-74, 76-79, 91-92, and 95-108 are presented for examination. No new matter has been added. Applicant has filed a Notice of Appeal with this response in order to preserve the right to appeal in the event the claimed subject matter is not found to be allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledge Examiner's conclusion that claims 34-39, 71-74, and 76-79 are allowable.

Applicant agrees that the features recited in the Examiner's reasons for allowance are not taught or suggested by the art of record, and that the allowed independent claims (i.e., claims 34, 71, and 76) are distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the reasons stated in the reasons for allowance, which are sufficient for allowance of all claims depending therefrom. Applicant does not concede that the stated reasons are the only grounds for patentability of the allowed claims, that the features excluded from the reasons for allowance are taught or suggested by the art of record, or that all of the features are necessary for patentability of the allowed claims or other claims directed to the disclosed subject matter.

Claims 69 and 70 were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, the features of claims 69 and 70 have been incorporated in claims 55 and 95, respectively. Claims 69 and 70 have been canceled. Confirmation of the allowability of claims 55 and 95 is requested.

Each of claims 56-68, 91-92, and 96-110 dependent from either claim 55 or claim 95 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicant: David H. Levy Attorney's Docket No.: 13159-002001

Serial No.: 09/862,948 Filed: May 22, 2001 Page: 18 of 19

35 U.S.C. §102/103

Claim 55 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. 6,377,685 ("Krishnan"). Claims 56-68 and 91-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan as applied to claim 55. As stated above, Applicant amended claim 55 to include the features of claim 69, which was identified as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 55, as currently amended, is patentable for at least the reasons articulated by the Examiner with respect to claim 69. Claims 56-68 and 91-92 depend from claim 55 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 21-22 and 24-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan in view of U.S. Pat. 7,092,520 ("Fuhrman"). Claims 80-84 and 93-94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan in view of U.S. 5,940,015 ("Thornton"). Claims 21-22, 24-29, 80-84, and 93-94 have been canceled, and as such, the rejections of claims 21-22, 24-29, 80-84, and 93-94 are now moot.

Applicant: David H. Levy Attorney's Docket No.: 13159-002001

Serial No. : 09/362,948 Filed : May 22, 2001 Page : 19 of 19

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reason for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to amendment.

The amount of \$510 for the Petition for Three-Month Extension of Time fee and the amount of \$250 for the Notice of Appeal fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 13159-002001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19 2007

Fish & Richardson P.C. Telephone: (617) 542-5070 Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21435646 doc

Jámes W. Babineau Reg. No. 42,276